Appl. No. 10/595,781 Amdt. Dated February 2, 2009 Reply to Office action of February 25, 2009 Attorney Docket No. P17248-US1

EUS/J/P/09-3124

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 19 and 23 and added new claim 27. The

Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 19,

21-23 and 25-27 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the

application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the

following remarks.

Response to Examiner's remarks

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough and studied response to the

Applicant's previous arguments.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 19 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated

by Choe, et al. (Choe hereafter) (US 2004/0114732 A1). The Applicant respectfully

traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Applicant's present invention allows the provision of multimedia data related

to a terminal of a called (or calling party), wherein one or both of the terminals may be

incapable of actually providing the multimedia data. A core network node receives a call

set up message from a calling party providing an identification of a called party. A

demand for multimedia information is included in subscriber data that is retrieved by the

core network node. The demand is executed and multimedia information associated

with the called party (or calling party) is then sent to the calling party terminal (various

Summary paragraphs, e.g., para. [0016]). The subscriber data of either or both a calling

party and called party, includes the demand for a multimedia response. As disclosed in

the present invention, the "demand" limitation is part of the subscriber data (para.

[0016]). The core network node reads the subscriber data and reacts to the demand by

providing an address of the multimedia data associated with that called party that can

be retrieved by terminals.(para. [0022]) (also applies to a calling party)

Page 5 of 8

Appl. No. 10/595,781 Amdt. Dated February 2, 2009 Reply to Office action of February 25, 2009 Attorney Docket No. P17248-US1 EUS/J/P/09-3124

The Choe reference discloses an apparatus and method for editing a ring back tone – Editable <u>Personalized Ring Back Tone service</u> (Ringback tones are normally supplied by the called party to the calling party, and Choe does not teach away from that understanding). Choe teaches the providing of a means for a subscriber to personalize a <u>ringback tone</u> for playback to a caller. In operation, the Choe reference discloses that if a called party is a subscriber, "...the PRBT system accesses an Internet Data Center to retrieve the message settings based on the called party/subscriber's account information ..." (para [0029]). The PRBT system of the Choe reference determines whether the calling party is a service subscriber. If the called party is a subscriber, the system provides a ringback message, edited by the called party, to the calling party (para [0028]).

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Choe reference discloses ringback tone, and modification of tones, only. As the Applicant's independent claims recite "A method for providing multimedia information associated with a calling party terminal to a called party terminal or for providing multimedia information associated with the called party terminal to the calling party terminal,...". The limitations of the claim applies to either a calling party or a called party. The Choe reference discloses the functions that are performed by a called party – actually subscriber – to modify a ringback tone available to the subscriber (called party because the tone is a ringback tone). In the Applicant's invention, the calling party can actually provide a tone to the called party. This is not disclosed in Choe.

MPEP § 2131 provides:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claims.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection does not meet the above requirements for at least the reason of the independent claims being currently

Appl. No. 10/595,781

Amdt. Dated February 2, 2009

Reply to Office action of February 25, 2009 Attorney Docket No. P17248-US1

Attorney Docket No. P173 EUS/J/P/09-3124

amended. Regarding amended claims 19 and 23, the Applicant respectfully submits that

the Choe reference does not disclose stored, subscriber data with a trigger (data

includes a demand) for presenting multimedia information by one terminal to another

terminal. And, Choe does not disclose sending an address for either party to retrieve

multimedia information for playback. So, the Applicant respectfully submits that the

rejection is unsupported by the art. Claims 19 and 23 are analogous independent claims

and contain similar limitations. The Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of

these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claim 21, 22 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Choe in view of Nguyen et al. (US 2004/0120477 A1). The Applicant

respectfully traverses the rejection of the rejection of these claims.

Nguyen discloses a system and method of providing a message to a terminating

point of a call. Nguyen does not disclose recognizing a demand from the subscriber

data or providing the multimedia information to the calling party in response to the

demand; both limitations missing from the Choe reference.

Claims 21, 22 and 26 all depend from independent claims 19 and 23 and recite

further limitations in combination with the novel elements of these claims. Therefore,

the allowance of claims 21, 22 and 26 is respectfully requested.

Page 7 of 8

Appl. No. 10/595,781

Amdt. Dated February 2, 2009 Reply to Office action of February 25, 2009

Attorney Docket No. P17248-US1

EUS/J/P/09-3124

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

<u>The Applicant requests a telephonic interview</u> if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By Sidney L. Weatherford

Registration No. 45,602

Date: April 3, 2009

Ericsson Inc.

6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11

Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656

sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com